

REMARKS

Claims 11-20 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-10 have been cancelled. Claims 11-20 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3, 4 and 6-8 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wako, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,415,224). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 1, 2 and 10 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wako, et al. in view of Haimi-Cohen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,760,431). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 3, 4 and 6-8 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wako, et al. in view of Noguchi, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,707,387). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 5 and 9 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 11-20 have been drafted to replace original Claims 1-10. Independent Claims 11 and 20 each relate to an operating device in a vehicle for operating multiple systems. According to the operating device of this invention, operation items in one system are compared with operation items in the other systems as well as in the same system, and if a particular operation item is used more frequently than the other operation items, the particular operation item is moved to a higher-level screen. Therefore, when, for example, an operating item for setting the temperature in an air conditioning system initially on a higher-level screen, if the operation item for a telephone number search in a NAVI system is operated more frequently than the operating item for setting the temperature in the air conditioning system, the operating item for the telephone number search in a NAVI system moves to the higher-level screen and the operating item for setting the temperature in an air conditioning system moves to a lower-level screen.

Wako, et al. discloses a navigation system which displays information in different forms and contents depending on whether the vehicle is in motion or is standing still. When the vehicle is stationary, the system can perform all of the functions. When the vehicle is in motion, the system provides simplified and limited functions. Wako, et al.

teaches that in the "in motion" mode, it is best to highlight the middle item as shown in screen 68 of Figure 5 so that all of the choices in the menu are only two clicks away. (column 8, lines 22-27). Wako, et al. also teaches that the most frequently used item should be placed in the center of the screen so it will be immediately high-lighted. Less frequently used items are listed adjacent the middle item so they are one click away and the least frequently used items are adjacent the second items so that they are two clicks away. (column 8, lines 27-37). Wako, et al. does not disclose keeping track of the number of times an item is used and does not disclose moving specified items to different screen levels.

The Examiner then goes to Haimi-Cohen to provide the necessary counting of use of items. Haimi-Cohen discloses the updating of a speed dial list based upon the use of a telephone number. Thus, the combination of Haimi-Cohen with Wako, et al. may teach how to order the various items on screen 68 in Figure 5, but Haimi-Cohen does not teach moving items to different level screens as is defined in new Claims 11 and 20. In addition, the present invention compares individual items from a plurality of systems and from these multiple systems the present invention selects the most frequently used items. Wako, et al. only deals with a navigation system which operates in one way when the vehicle is moving and a different way when it is stationary. It does not move items to different screen levels as is defined in the present invention. Haimi-Cohen also does not move items between different screen levels. It simply maintains a single list based on frequency of use.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 11 and 20 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 12-19, which ultimately depend from Claim 11, are also


believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2005

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg